

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF  
THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
ON JANUARY 31, 1986  
IN LISNER HALL, ROOM 603

- 1 The meeting was called to order by President Elliott at 2:15 p.m.

Present: President Elliott, Registrar Grimm, Castleberry, Cheh, East, Eldridge, Frey, Greene, Griffith, Hill, Kelly, Liebowitz, Lovett, Levy, Morgan, Parrish, Pierpont, Rashid, D. Robinson, L. Robinson, Smith, Solomon, Wallace, and Ziolkowski

Absent: Vice President French, Parliamentarian Schechter, Altshuler, Barron, Birnbaum, Claeysens, Della Torre, Fox, Kenney, Loeser, Schiff, Schiller, Singpurwalla, and Tolchin

Professor Griffith, on behalf of the Executive Committee, outlined the procedures for conducting the discussion of the Faculty Senate's response to the Report of the Commission for the Year 2000. First, the Senate would hear the response of the Senate Special Committee (an "overview") and then the responses of the Senate Standing Committees to the List of Recommendations and Distinctive Aspirations assigned to various Senate Committees for study. He suggested that specific resolutions be delayed to a later meeting in order to devote this meeting to a general discussion. Before the discussion began, President Elliott welcomed all of the visitors and invited their comments as well. He noted that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Everett H. Bellows, whose association with GW began in 1931, was present.

- 2 (a) Professor Cheh, Chair of the Special Committee, outlined the charge of the Committee which was basically to look at the Report in a general way and to generate individual faculty response. After much discussion, the Committee concluded that, although it was not clear what the purpose of the Report was, or whether the Report, as constituted, would generate any kind of faculty response, there were three general unifying themes in the Report as follows: (1) commitment that the University move in the direction of becoming more research oriented; (2) the question of centralization/decentralization; and (3) advantage of the Washington, D. C. location. The committee's questionnaire asked faculty to give their views on these three points by asking both open-ended and close-ended questions. Professor Cheh stressed that the Committee made no claim

whatsoever that this survey was intended as a valid scientific poll, but thought it a useful method for soliciting individual faculty response. She said that about one-fourth of the faculty responded and that this data will be analyzed and reported to the Senate at a later date. Finally, she said, the Special Committee, in its preliminary discussion, made some general observations of its own about the Report. The committee did not think the Report addressed those matters that would make the University a better University. For example, the Report was not an academic plan because it fails to address the need for general curricula reform and fails to set priorities; it pays scant attention to faculty development, and it fails to provide a new and different approach to building a stronger University by utilizing its present strengths. In concluding the preliminary report of the Special Committee, Professor Cheh said that the committee agreed that the Senate should call upon the administration by formal resolution asking that all steps to implement the Report be reported to the Senate on a periodic basis, in writing, before such steps are taken, so that the Senate will have a role in this process. She then called upon Professors Rycroft and Wallace, members of the Special Committee, who spoke about data contained in the Summary of Faculty Questionnaire distributed at the meeting. (Summary attached.)

- 2 (b) The responses of Senate Standing Committees to the Major Recommendations and Distinctive Aspirations of the Commission Report follow:

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) RECOMMENDATION: The University should establish plans and policies that will enable it to develop into a research institution of the first rank.

Senate Committees: Research; Educational and Admissions Policy; and Physical Facilities

The Research Committee strongly endorsed the Report's recommendations for increased emphasis on research, and will present resolutions to the Senate to assist in the implementation of policies to enable the University to develop into a better research institution. The Educational and Admissions Policy Committee supported this recommendation, but pointed out the need for an atmosphere of interest in research throughout the campus, the need for funding, and the need for facilities to accom-

moderate research, as well as teaching. The Physical Facilities Committee indicated that new and upgraded facilities would be required for expansion of research capabilities, and that research activities must be firmly wedded to the teaching mission of the University; therefore planning facilities for these two activities must go hand-in-hand.

(2) RECOMMENDATION: The University should review the undergraduate program of general education in the near future.

Senate Committee: Educational and Admissions Policy

The Educational and Admissions Policy Committee indicated that such a review should already be in place and occurring periodically. The committee suggested that a five-year plan be put in place in each school to be continued on a regular basis and coordinated within each school. Also, the University should identify weak areas and build on strong ones.

(3) RECOMMENDATION: The University should develop a major new program emphasis in the field of communications.

Senate Committee: Educational and Admissions Policy

The Educational and Admissions Policy Committee recommended that a new program, such as this, should be developed only after a very detailed study of the University's existing programs is made with a view to identifying priorities.

(4) RECOMMENDATION: The University should take steps to strengthen the position of the performing arts within the liberal arts and to enable the performing arts to play a more important role in the life of the campus.

Senate Committees: Educational and Admissions Policy;  
University and Urban Affairs

The Educational and Admissions Policy Committee recommended the need for evaluation of existing programs before developing new programs. The University and Urban Affairs Committee supported the recommendation, with the view that not only should the performing arts play an important role in the life of the campus, but also "in the lives of the residents of the D. C. community."

(5) RECOMMENDATION: The University should support the three libraries in their acquisition of the technology needed to provide access to information and material appropriate to a research university of quality and to manage increasingly complex library operations.

Senate Committee: Libraries

The Libraries Committee endorsed the recommendation, which appears consistent with current plans of the libraries, and urges that efforts to acquire needed technology to provide access to information be complemented by strong efforts to develop the libraries' collection of information. The Committee reviewed the Executive Summary of the Gelman Library Remodeling Plan and view this concept as extremely useful for implementing the Report's recommendation.

(6) RECOMMENDATION: The Division of Continuing Education and Summer Sessions should be reorganized to clarify its role and activities to members of the University community, and to prospective students and interested organizations outside the community.

Senate Committee: University and Urban Affairs

The University and Urban Affairs Committee endorsed this recommendation, in general, and recommended to the new Dean that he or she cooperate with other schools and universities to serve community needs, including the development of programs aimed at local audiences.

(7) RECOMMENDATION: The University should initiate additional steps to support faculty development in research and teaching.

Senate Committees: Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies; University Development and Resources; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

The Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee recommended the following: (1) that the University make annual increments to faculty salaries which are designed to achieve, and to maintain, a number one rating (80th percentile or above) on the American Association of University Professors' scale for Category I Institutions; and (2) that the University reduce its reliance on part-time faculty staffing by creating more full-time positions in those departments where it is deemed preferable on the basis of academic considerations; and further, that part-time salaries be adjusted to, and



maintained at, a level which would give the University a "competitive edge" in the Washington area. The Committee also suggested that the University explore the possibility of providing alternative lunchtime dining facilities which would be less formal and less expensive than those at the University Club, in order to promote greater collegiality among all ranks of instruction. The University Development and Resources Committee supported the recommendation, but agreed that one of the first things that has to be ascertained is what support services presently exist in order to determine what the goal would be in this area and how to proceed. The Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee indicated its discussion was focused on the Office of Sponsored Research. For both symbolic and practical reasons, the Committee recommended that (1) the Office of Sponsored Research be transferred to the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs, and (2) that the Office of Sponsored Research, wherever it be located, show greater research activity for faculty research by exercising greater flexibility in negotiating direct costs for funding agencies. The Research Committee also responded by urging all departments or units to schedule research seminars and colloquia which should be supported by the administration to further research communication between departments.

(8) RECOMMENDATION: The University should continue to build faculty morale and take new steps to foster a sense of academic community.

Senate Committees: Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies

The Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee suggested that the University explore alternate lunchtime dining facilities for faculty that would encourage greater collegiality across department lines and across instructional lines.

(9) RECOMMENDATION: The University should provide more financial assistance in the form of loans and scholarships. To help support expanded programs, student financial aid should receive high priority in fund-raising.

Senate Committees: Student Financial Aid; University and Urban Affairs; University Development and Resources

The University and Urban Affairs Committee agreed with the recommendation; however, the committee recommended an examination of GW's current recruitment of undergraduate

honor students; the committee also recognized the tremendous need for financial aid at the graduate level, which should also be studied. The University Development and Resources Committee supported the recommendation; it appeared to the committee that the average faculty member did not know much about the workings of the Office of Student Financial Aid and the Development Office and the committee will be discussing ways of raising the visibility of these offices among faculty members. (No report was presented by the Student Financial Aid Committee.)

(10) RECOMMENDATION: The University should continue to work with student groups to provide a program of all-University activities that promote the development of a campus community.

Senate Committees: Joint Committee of Faculty and Students; Athletics; Honors and Academic Convocations

The Joint Committee of Faculty and Students indicated that it was continuing its discussion of this recommendation and did not have a specific recommendation to make at this time. The Athletics Committee stressed that intercollegiate teams should be supported as much as possible because sports can and do promote a feeling of campus community. The Honors and Academic Convocations Committee supported this recommendation, noting that events, such as the Honors Convocation, Homecoming, and others, are excellent vehicles for promoting a sense of campus community. The committee would like to see other student activities developed and will present resolutions to the Senate on these proposals.

(11) RECOMMENDATION: At the earliest possible time, the University should provide modern laboratories for teaching in the natural sciences and engineering, and additional facilities to support research and teaching in these areas.

Senate Committees: Research; Physical Facilities and University Development and Resources

The Research Committee strongly supported this recommendation. The Physical Facilities Committee recommended that, in addition to providing adequate facilities for research and teaching, equal consideration must also be given to upgrading and acquiring special equipment and major instrumentation. The University Development and Resources Committee strongly urged that some

kind of plan be developed because there are different laboratory needs in different schools; the committee suggested that a University-Wide Committee be established to accomplish the goal of this recommendation in a unified effort.

(12) RECOMMENDATION: The University should develop a coordinated planning process to support its efforts for significantly greater academic quality and distinction.

Senate Committees: Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

(No report was presented by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee.)

#### DISTINCTIVE ASPIRATIONS

(1) RECOMMENDATION: George Washington University should develop an international emphasis in all schools and colleges.

Senate Committees: Educational and Admissions Policy

The Educational and Admissions Policy Committee endorsed this recommendation, but expressed its view that consideration must be given to support facilities, otherwise the the prospect for achieving an international role would be rather poor.

(2) RECOMMENDATION: The University should develop the present school of Public and International Affairs to serve as the cornerstone for the University's diverse programs in School of International Affairs.

Senate Committees: Educational and Admissions Policy;  
University Development and Resources

The Educational and Admissions Policy Committee endorsed this recommendation, recognizing that centralization was necessary and that was the appropriate place where emphasis on coordination should be placed. The University Development and Resources Committee offered no recommendations at this time. The Physical Facilities Committee, though not asked to study this recommendation, recommended the development of a Conference Center with first-class facilities to accommodate programs and receptions and to provide some housing for visiting scholars and dignitaries.

(3) RECOMMENDATION: The University should initiate steps that will result in the strengthening of its re-

Special Faculty Senate Meeting, January 31, 1986, p. 8

search capability in the area of government. The University should also make a major effort to offer students in every school and college a unique opportunity to relate their studies to the processes of modern government.

Senate Committees: Research; Educational and Admissions Policy

The Research Committee supported this recommendation, but would place higher priority on the previous recommendations regarding research. The Educational and Admissions Policy Committee supported this recommendation although viewing it as secondary to earlier recommendations on research.

(4) RECOMMENDATION: The University should develop a Center for the Study of Public Policy to aid in developing research programs, particularly those which emphasize multidisciplinary activities, and to facilitate and strengthen current faculty research.

Senate Committees: Research; University Development and Resources

The Research Committee endorsed this recommendation. The University Development and Resources Committee reported that this recommendation was still under discussion and therefore had no recommendation to make at this time.

(5) RECOMMENDATION: Technology must play a greater role in all the University's educational programs, research activities, and administrative operations.

Senate Committees: Research; Educational and Admissions Policy; Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty

The Research Committee and the Educational and Admissions Policy Committee made no comments, having alluded to this in earlier comments concerning educational programs and research activities. The Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty supported this recommendation.



(6) RECOMMENDATION: The University should rationalize and substantially expand its use of computer systems for educational and administrative purposes.

Senate Committee: Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty

The Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty supported the expansion of the use of computer systems; however, the committee voiced concern about the cost and priority of such expansion.

This completed the responses of the Senate Committees to the Major Recommendations and Distinctive Aspirations. The President called upon Professor Greene who read the following "additional recommendation" submitted by the Physical Facilities Committee relating to the discussion in terms of the future of the Commission Report for the Year 2000:

The Physical Facilities Committee also recommends that the proposed Campus Master Plan, upon adoption, be implemented in coordination with the recommendations of the Report of the Commission for the Year 2000. The Master Plan should also be periodically reviewed to assure that it reflects the most current academic plans and priorities. Long-term space needs should be clearly correlated with the development potential embodied in the Campus Master Plan before considering off-campus expansion and further that space planning should recognize the specific needs for physical proximity of programmatical-ly-related faculty facilities.

Professor Morgan commented that, obviously, it was very difficult for the Senate to oppose the Recommendations, especially when each one was addressed separately. The problem, he said, seemed to be one of priorities, and until that problem is addressed, he said he did not see how the Senate could seriously and sensibly respond to the Commission's Recommendations.

Professor Griffith said that the Senate's discussion of the Commission Report was very constructive although somewhat diffuse. The next problem facing the Senate, however, was the question of how the Senate wished to proceed from this point. He said that the Executive Committee and/or the Special Committee would welcome the advice of the Senate about specific issues to be proposed for Senate consideration. He indicated that possibly the March 21st Senate meeting would be an appropriate time for taking up resolutions pertaining to the Commission Report.

Professor Cheh, Chair of the Special Committee, said that she was very gratified to hear the response of the Senate Committees to this Report. She observed that if the Commission Report is viewed as an agenda, and only that, then she thought it highly successful. But, as stated earlier, she said the committee did not have a clear understanding of the status, role and significance of this Report--what it's supposed to be, what it's supposed to be used for, and what it's supposed to trigger. She said that the Special Committee will attempt to determine what the responses to its questionnaire mean and will report back to the Senate.

Professor Rashid said that, in listening to all of the comments, it occurred to her that one of the problems is that there really isn't a linear set of priorities, but rather a set of "nested boxes" where many things are nested within other things. She thought that it would be useful to try to cluster some of the issues.

- 3      Upon motion made and seconded, President Elliott adjourned the Special Meeting at 4:04 p.m.



Theodore H. Grimm, Jr.  
Secretary

SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE  
(close-ended questions)

The university-wide faculty responses to the Year 2000 questionnaire are displayed in Table 1, with the "strongly agree" and "agree" categories collapsed and the same done for "strongly disagree" and "disagree." As this table shows, several of the questions elicited dramatic response patterns. Fully half the questions featured more than two-thirds of the total respondents falling into either the collapsed agree or disagree categories (the underlined cells in the table). The strongest positive faculty responses were in support of fostering a greater sense of university, placing more emphasis on the University as a research institution, making a special commitment to part-time and continuing education students, and developing more inter-school programs of study. Almost as strong were the support levels for giving the Year 2000 report priorities prior to implementing it, strengthening Columbian College, improving facility development related to the University's research capability, and strengthening research in the area of government. Thus, the faculty appears to support a variety of recommendations in both the teaching and research arenas.

On the negative side, the faculty respondents do not appear ready to make cutbacks in existing programs in order to pursue a new communications program. Nor do they support the strengthening of Columbian College if doing so means a deemphasis on the graduate and professional schools. Resource trade-offs appear to be a sensitive issue.

Perhaps equally striking are the patterns of responses to questions about expanding programs into suburban areas, the creation of a communications program emphasis, and using sports activities as a vehicle for fostering greater union. On each of these issues, the respondents were split almost exactly down the middle. Almost as equally divisive were questions about deemphasizing the degree of school and college autonomy, centralizing planning, making a greater commitment to the Washington metropolitan area, and strengthening the performing arts to enhance a sense of unity.

TABLE 1.

## UNIVERSITY-WIDE RESULTS OF FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>Question</u>	<u>Percent Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Percent Neutral</u>	<u>Percent Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
1. Emphasize Research	<u>87</u>	6	8
4. Too Great Autonomy	46	24	30
5. More Inter-School Programs	<u>82</u>	14	4
6. Strengthen Columbian	<u>76</u>	18	6
7. Deemphasize Professional	24	9	<u>68</u>
8. Foster Sense of University	<u>90</u>	7	3
9. Strengthen Performing Arts	41	36	20
10. Emphasize Sports	35	28	39
12. Centralize Planning	43	20	37
13. Continuing, Part-time Students	<u>84</u>	11	6
14. International Emphasis	53	27	20
15. International Cornerstone SPIA	49	32	20
16. Government Research Strengthening	<u>69</u>	18	13
17. Center for Study of Public Policy	61	24	15
18. Commitment to Washington	43	30	27



Table 1, continued.

<u>Question</u>	<u>Percent Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Percent Neutral</u>	<u>Percent Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
19. Communications Program	35	35	30
20. Communications If Other Cutbacks	10	11	<u>79</u>
26. Research Facility Development	<u>72</u>	17	11
28. Expand Suburban Locations	34	32	35
29. Give Report Priorities	<u>77</u>	16	6

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

January 14, 1986

There will be a Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate on Friday, January 31, 1986, in Lisner Hall 603 at 2:10 p.m., called by the President at the request of the Executive Committee for the sole purpose of discussion of the Report of the Commission for the Year 2000 by the Senate Special Committee and Standing Committees.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Discussion of the Report of the Commission for the Year 2000 by:
  - (a) Faculty Senate Special Committee on Report of Commission for the Year 2000; and
  - (b) Faculty Senate Standing Committees
3. Adjournment



Theodore H. Grimm, Jr.  
Secretary